DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 695 TM 004 970

AUTHOR	Haggett, William F.
TITLE	Philadelphia Urban Education Network Project: Second-Year Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	R-7621
PUB DATE	Aug 75
NOTE	40p.; Reproduction of pages 18-19 will be of marginal quality
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Community Involvement; Educational Disadvantagement; Humanistic Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Innovation; Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *Student Needs; *Student Teachers; Teacher Education; Teacher Workshops; Urban Education; Urban Schools; *Urban Teaching; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Philadelphia Urban Education Network Project; William H Hunter School

ABSTRACT

The Philadelphia Urban Education Network Project is a staff development project that deals with the problems of the urban teacher and the needs of the urban students. Project activities include workshops, conferences, open houses, and teacher exchanges, all of which involve project participants. Staff development workshops are held to aid teachers develop organizational strategies, curricula, and instructional practices. All five project objectives were attained. Progress has been made in the following areas during the 1974-1975 school year: (1) an increase in the use of individualized and small group instruction; (2) an increase in the use of affective approaches in instruction; (3) training of student-teachers in an urban setting; and (4) getting the community involved in various school activities. Appendixes contain the instruments used in the study and their results. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115695

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROJECT

Second-Year Final Report

Report Number

7621

Report Prepared by

William F. Haggett

FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

August, 1975

TM004970

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Michael P. Marcase

Executive Deputy Superintendent
Robert L. Poindexter

Associate Superintendent for School Services
David A. Horowitz

Executive Director, Office of Federal Programs
Thomas C. Rosica

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Arthur W. Thomas, President
Dolores Oberholtzer, Vice-President
Augustus Baxter
Tobyann Boonin
Philip Davidoff
George Hutt
William Ross
Robert M. Sebastian
Alec Washco, Jr.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Michael H. Kean, Executive Director
Research and Evaluation

Stephen H. Davidoff, Assistant Director
Federal Evaluation Resource Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
The Project	2
Rationale	2
Expected Outcomes	3
Mode of Operation	3
Previous Findings	4
The 1974-1975 Evaluation	4
Implementation	4
Attainment of Objectives	5
Summary and Conclusions	8
Tables and Appendices	9

PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROJECT

The Philadelphia Urban Education Network Project (PUENP) is a staff-development project at the William H. Hunter School. Based on the findings of the Five State Conference on the Effective Urban Teacher and on subsequent Pennsylvania Department of Education meetings, the project deals with the problems of the urban teacher and the needs of the urban child.

RATIONALE

Hunter School has many of the problems of a school serving the urban poor. With fewer than 400 students and a strong faculty and staff, however, the school was thought to be an ideal situation for a pilot network project.

The PUNEP is part of a tri-state program involving representatives from New York (City, District 7), New Jersey (Atlantic City), and Pennsylvania (Erie, Harrisburg, Chester, and Philadelphia). The network sponsors and participates in Interstate Urban Education Network Schools Conferences (three of which were held during the 1974-1975 school year). The meetings keep member schools and other interested organizations informed of activities occuring in the various projects.

Teachers in urban schools often have difficulty teaching the educationally disadvantaged child. Some experienced teachers can survive problems, but often cannot solve them. A lack of communication between teachers and student-teachers, and among teachers themselves, is an added problem.

Specifically, the needs of the Hunter faculty were:

a) the need to develop new methods of training student-teachers, taking into account their individual requirements, skills, and attitudes;

b) the need to make the student-teacher a more active and responsible member of the total school community;

c) the need to develop new skills among regularly appointed teachers, by sharing skills and experiences. The new approaches could be used to instruct urban children in basic skills, and to humanize urban education at the classroom level;

d) the need for present staff to develop and strengthen abilities for effectively transmitting the results of theier experience to student-teachers;

e) the need to develop in all school staff members the spirit of belonging to a team with a common goal;

f) the need for student-teachers and experienced staff to learn about the surrounding community's problems, resources, and strengths;

g) the need for drawing together the school and community for the common purpose of providing better, more meaningful education for Hunter students;

h) the need for greater awareness of the learning problems of non-English speaking children and for the development of more effective techniques for teaching the children.

The needs were still present in the second year of the project. The objectives for the 1974-1975 school year reflect most of the identified needs.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

It is expected that PUNEP will more fully humanize the educational process for students and teachers at Hunter. It also is expected the project will:

a) enable current teachers to better evaluate their classroom problems and to arrive at possible solutions;

b) provide more effective ways of training student-teachers for service in urban schools;

c) help current teachers to better utilize student-teachers;

d) assist all classroom staff to become more sensitive to the emotional as well as educational needs of their students.

MODE OF OPERATION

Teachers at Hunter School volunteer to become active participants in project activities. After volunteering, teachers attend project sponsored workshops and conferences and participate in school open-houses for community members. Teachers are paid on the current School District staff development schedule.

Workshops, conferences, open-houses, and teacher exchanges, involving both teachers at Hunter School and the tri-state participating schools, were the primary activities of PUNENP.

The program, through staff development, seeks to help teachers develop organizational strategies, curricula, and instructional practices to better aid children in the learning process. Additionally, the teachers felt their own student-teaching experiences had not helped them in dealing with problems specific to

urban students. Work has been done to stress this aspect for those student teaching at Hunter School.

PREVIOUS FINDINGS

Because 1973-1974 was the project's first year in operation, its evaluation was formative and concentrated on the receptiveness of the teachers to new ideas presented. Questionnaire results indicated that the teachers were receptive to most ideas presented in the workshops. (Some workshop topics included resource rooms and areas, open classroom, affective education, creative dramatics, gaming, SRA reading kits, and discussion of student teacher experiences.) Additionally, monitoring visits, student teachers' responses on a questionnaires, and teachers perceptions of their own teaching style indicated that 50% had adopted the use of activity centers and that the majority of these teachers were experimenting with the open classroom teaching style.

THE 1974-1975 EVALUATION

The current year's evaluation of the project focused upon staff-development activities, roles and responsibilities of student-teachers, and student achievement in basic skills. Questionnaires for teachers and student-teachers were designed to identify needs and to assess the project's progress (see Appendix A). An observational checklist was used to look at teaching strategy, the grouping of students, the role of adult aides, and other areas of staff-development training (see Appendix B). The evaluator monitored classrooms and staff-development workshops. Student achievement was examined using results of the California Achievement Tests. The evaluator has tried to keep project participants continually informed of evaluation activities.

IMPLEMENTATION

Fifty-four staff members at Hunter School participated in the project. This year's participants included the project coordinator, the principal, 25 teachers, 21 aides, two librarians, two secretaries, a counselor, and a School-Community-Coordinator.

Planned activities for the 1974-1975 school year included 24 afternoon and five Saturday staff development workshops. The meetings were for all project participants. Topics dealt with included ways of meeting project goals, new educational materials, and new educational approaches. Appendix C contains a list of workshop topics.

This year, greater emphasis was placed on instructing the staff and students in the cultural backgrounds of the community's population (60% Spanish-speaking, 35% black, and 5% white). To do this, a two-week summer workshop for teachers

and other staff was held. The Spanish language and Puerto Rican culture were the topics discussed. The bilingual education staff created a Cultural Awareness Program for students. Included in this program was a slide show of Puerto Rico, unit lessons, a newsletter, and an overall awareness of the Puerto Rican culture.

The staff has tried to involve the community in the school's activities. Three Community Open Houses were held throughout the school year. Held on Saturday mornings, the Open Houses got parents of students and other neighborhood residents to visit the school, to interact with the faculty, and to participate in the various activities. Open House activities included sampling ethnic foods (prepared by the faculty and staff), receiving the recipes in Spanish and English, meeting with the faculty, seeing a slide presentation of the school and PUENP activities, and taking a trip to a Young Audiences presentation.

In another project activity, the project coordinator and the Elementary Mathematics Resource Teacher ran mathematics workshops for parents. Parents of kindergarten and first graders met weekly for an hour workshop. The workshops dealt with ways parents might aid their children in obtaining math skills. Also, areas of interest of the parents were covered.

The community is involved in PUENP in other ways, too. Reading Aides and some Classroom Aides were drawn from community members. The Hunter Home and School Association was reactivated. Community persons also attended PUENP workshops.

The project director has continued to emphasize individualized instruction and affective educational techniques. The evaluator's observations show classes were, indeed, being made more individualized.

Problems arose with defining affective educational techniques. At the beginning of the school year, the evaluator looked for specific affective techniques, such as role-playing, magic circle, and "I" - message. Hunter teachers, however, interpreted "affective" to mean "feeling' or "emotional", as opposed to "cognitive." The evaluators and teachers then developed a checklist of affective behaviors. Appendix D contains the checklist now being used in observing affective behaviors.

ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: To increase teachers' knowledge of innovative educational techniques.

This objective has been attained. Twenty-four afternoon and five Saturday morning workshops were held. On the average more than 90% of the Hunter staff

attended the workshops. At the workshops, various educational techniques and materials were presented and discussed (see Appendix C). Classroom observations show the techniques and materials were being used.

Objective 2: To facilitate the reorganization of the school so that new techniques can be employed.

This objective was partially attained. A group of four teachers, termed "The Cluster", engaged in team teaching 120 low-achieving second-, third-, and fourth-grade students. The four teachers met daily in joint planning sessions. The teachers used affective and cognitive techniques learned through PUENP. Classroom observations showed that some of the techniques used were a modified-open structure, the grouping students on the basis of ability rather than grade, and activity-centered concepts.

Other faculty members taught in separate classrooms. Classes were combined on many occasions, however, to work on projects, to employ different teaching techniques, and to provide a different environment for both students and teachers.

Objective 3: To increase the amount of individual and small group instruction.

This objective has been attained. Observations made in October and November showed that 25% of the classes were individualized or in a small group setting. Comparable observations made during May and June showed that in 70% of the classes observed, small group instruction was taking place. In 40% of the classes observed in May and June, individualized instruction was present. Summaries of these observations appear in Appendix D.

Objective 4: To increase teachers' affective skills and foster trust among children and adults.

This objective has been attained. Affective education workshops were held last year and were held weekly for reading aides this year. With the Hunter staff's help, the evaluator developed a checklist of affective behaviors (see Appendix E). The checklist included observable examples of affective approaches to teaching. The evaluator used the instrument in classroom observations. The results indicated that an average of five of the 22 affective behaviors were observed in each class. The behaviors most often observed included "having students contribute something they know how to do," "let kids feel good about themselves sometime during the day," "encourage children to relate to teachers as people by relating personal experiences," and "displaying children's work."

The evaluator used an unobtrusive measure of "trust among children and adults." He assumed that the more often teachers used small group and individualized instruction, the more trust the teacher had in students and in their ability

to work independantly. Both small group and individualized instruction increased from the beginning to the end of the year (see Appendix D). The evaluator concluded the amount of trust among children and adults had increased.

Objective 5: To transmit these skills to student-teachers.

This objective has been attained. Student-teachers were an integral part of PUENP this year. The student-teachers were included in all project activities, especially staff-development workshops. The evaluator developed and administered a questionnaire to student-teachers to find out the effects of PUENP on their professional training. Each student-teacher completed a questionnaire following his or her stay with a cooperating teacher. Since student-teachers generally stayed with a cooperating teacher for seven weeks, each completed two questionnaires. Results are shown in Appendix F. Responses show student-teachers believe: (1) their experience at Hunter was worthwhile; (2) the regular staff was extremely helpful in transmitting teaching skills to them; (3) student-teachers would accept a full-time teaching position at Hunter if offered.

Long-Range Objective

Although not formally recited as a project objective in the 1974-1975 evaluation plan, an overall goal of PUNEP is to improve Hunter students' basic skills. The evaluator compared Hunter California Achievement Test (CAT) reading and mathematics scores from the May, 1974, and February, 1975, test administrations.

Table 1 shows Reading and Mathematics total scores for three grade levels. (These are the only groups for whom both 1974 and 1975 CAT scores were available.) The mean increase for reading was 6.7 months, the mean increase for mathematics was 8.6 months. Seven months of instruction intervened between the two test administrators.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Philadelphia Urban Education Network Project is a staff development project which deals with the problems of the urban teacher and the needs of the urban child. Fifty-four staff members at Hunter School participate in the project's activities. Twenty-four afternoon and five Saturday staff-development workshops were held.

Progress has been made in the following areas: teacher awareness of Puerto Rican culture and the special needs of the bilingual student; involvement of the community in various school activities; increases in individualized group instruction; increase in the use of affective teaching techniques; and the training of student-teachers in an urban setting.

TABLES

1. Hunter CAT Scores 10

APPENDICES

A. Teacher and Student-Teacher Questionnaires 11

B. PUENP Observational Checklist 15

C. PUENP Staff Development Workshops (1974-1975) 17

D. Summary of Observational Checklists

October-November Observation Summary 18

May-June Observation Summary 21

Comparison of Early- and Late-Year Observations 24

E. PUENP Affective Checklist 25

F. Summaries of Student-Teacher Questionnaires

October Responses 26

December Responses 29

March Responses 32

May Responses 35

TABLE 1

HUNTER CAT SCORES - GRADE EQUIVALENTS (PERCENTILES)

Grade - as of 9/1/73	Reading		Mathematics	
	1974	1975	1974	1975
1	1.1(30)	1.8(26)	1.0(23)	2.4(51)
2	2.0(24)	2.5(26)	2.1(25)	2.7(21)
3	2.5(20)	3.3(29)	2.5(9)	3.1(15)

APPENDIX A

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
TITLE III EVALUATION SERVICES

PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROGRAM
(PUENP)

1. Circle the grades you teach at Hunter?

   K 1 2 3 4 Special Ed.

2. How many of the after school workshops were you able to attend out of the 24 given this year?

   0_____1-5_____6-10_____11-15_____16-20_____21+_____

3. Rank the objectives of the Urban Education Network according to your understanding of their priorities (i.e. 1 - highest, 5 - lowest).

   _____ To increase affective skills, and to foster trust among pupils and adults.

   _____ To increase the amount of individualized and small group instruction.

   _____ To increase knowledge of educational techniques that may be employed in teaching inner city children.

   _____ To facilitate the reorganization of the school so that new techniques may be employed.

   _____ To train student teachers to deal with the problems of inner city schools.

4. To what extent do you feel committed to the Urban Education Network?

   Not at all_____ Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

5. To what extent have you used individualized instructional techniques in your classroom this year?

   Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

6. To what extent have the activities and efforts of PUENP helped you to individualize instructional techniques?

   Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

7. To what extent have you used affective techniques (e.g. magic circle, "I-message", personal and concerned discussion) in your classroom this year?

   Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

8. To what extent has there been an increase of the use of affective techniques in your classroom over the course of the year?

   None_____Slight_____Moderate_____Extensive _____

9. To what extent has PUENP contributed to the increase of affective techniques in your classroom this year?

   Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

10. Looking at the following categories of teaching methodologies, which did you predominately use?

Beginning of year _____, _____ Style
1st 2nd

End of year _____, _____ Style
1st 2nd

A. Individually prescribed (Teacher assigns work in accordance with individual student academic needs, namely, where the student is "at")

B. Activity-centered (Students choose among available classroom resources, either working individually or in small groups)

C. Traditional (teacher addresses and assigns work to the whole class or large groups arranged according to ability, this usually being three groups - slow, medium, and fast)

D. Other (specify) _____

_____

11. In terms of your teaching practices, which area has undergone the most change as a result of the PUENP workshops?

_____ Classroom structure (e.g. activity centers)

_____ Usage of curriculum materials

_____ Audiovisual aids

_____ Affective techniques

_____ Creative dramatics

12. Did you have an aid in your classroom this year?

Yes_____ No_____

To what extent have the activities and efforts of PUENP helped you to better utilize your aid?

Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

13. Did you have a student teacher this year?

Yes_____ No_____

Please list some of the teaching experiences you provided for your student teacher.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

To what extent have the activities and efforts of PUENP helped you to better train student teachers on how to deal with the problems of inner city schools?

Not at all_____Slightly_____Moderately_____Extensively_____

14. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc. you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.

15

_____

_____

_____

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
TITLE III EVALUATION SERVICES

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FOR
PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROGRAM

1. NAME_____ DATE_____

2. COLLEGE_____

3. Circle the grades you taught while at Hunter School.

K 1 2 3 4 Special Ed.

4. What classroom learning arrangements did you try at Hunter? (check as many as you tried)

___ Individually prescribed (teacher assigns work in accordance with individual student academic needs, namely, where the student is "at")

___ Activity-centered (students choose among available classroom resources either working individually or in small groups)

___ Traditional (teacher addresses and assigns work to the whole class or to large groups arranged according to ability, this usually being three groups - slow, medium, and fast)

___ Other (specify) _____

5. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you use the most? (rank: 1 - highest, 2 - next highest; leave those choices that you did not use blank)

___ Individually prescribed

___ Activity-centered

___ Traditional

___ Other (specify)_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you feel the most success with? (rank: 1 - highest, 2 - next highest, etc.)

___ Individually prescribed

___ Activity-centered

___ Traditional

___ Other (specify)_____

_____

_____

7. Rank (1 - highest, 4 - lowest) as best you can the degree to which the following factors influenced your primary teaching style at Hunter School.

___ Suggestions from your collaborating teacher.

___ Examples set by your collaborating teacher.

___ Hunter workshops

___ Other (specify)_____

_____

8. Using the following categories of teaching methodologies, categorize the predominant styles of teaching you observed in your classroom. List the style observed most in the first blank and the style seen second most in the second blank.

_____, _____ style
1st 2nd

A. Individually prescribed

B. Activity-centered

C. Traditional

D. Other (specify)_____

_____

9. What areas did you recieve the most information and help on during your stay at Hunter? (rank: 1 to indicate your first choice, 2 your second choice, etc.)

_____ Curriculum _____ Community _____ Administration

_____ Audio-Visual Techniques _____ Methodology of Teaching

_____ Group Dynamics _____ Learning Theories _____ Discipline

_____ Games _____ Observation and Recording Techniques

_____ Nitty gritty of day to day survival (e.g., planning, etc.)

10. To what extent did you observe individualized instructional techniques and small-group instruction being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all_____ Slightly_____ Moderately_____ Extensively_____

11. To what extent did you use individualized instructional techniques and small-group instruction in the classroom?

Not at all_____ Slightly_____ Moderately_____ Extensively_____

12. To what extent did you observe affective techniques (e.g., magic circle, "I-message", personal and concerned discussion) being used in the classroom by you collaborating teacher?

Not at all_____ Slightly_____ Moderately_____ Extensively_____

13. To what extent did you use affective techniques while at Hunter?

Not at all_____ Slightly_____ Moderately_____ Extensively_____

14. In what ways did your cooperating teacher help you adjust to inner-city school teaching?

_____

_____

_____

15. If you had an opportunity to come back to Huner School to teach next year, would you? Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____

16. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc. you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.

_____

_____

_____

17

OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS RESEARCH

This form was developed for use in evaluation of federally funded program

Read CAUTION first!

1) PROJECT
2) PBRS NO.
3) SCHOOL
4) SCHOOL NUMBER
5) OBSERVER
6) DATE — DAY — 197_
7) OFFICIAL CONTACT ON ARRIVAL AT SITE — PRINCIPAL, VICE PRINCIPAL, ADM. ASSIST., SECRETARY, OTHER (EXPLAIN)
8) OBSERVATION BEGAN AT OR AFTER
9) OBSERV. LASTED AT LEAST — HR. MIN.
11 00, why?

CAUTION: Do not smudge the underside of this form. Place it on a clean, expendable sheet of paper. See User's Guide.

10) SPECIFIC CONDITIONS OBSERVED

Interview teacher for items A-D.
After determining A, ask the teacher to rank, from 1-5, PUENP's priorities.
___Training student teachers.
___Reorganizing the school for the employment of new educational techs
___Increasing the amount of individualized or small-group instruction.
___Increasing teachers' affective skills.
___Increasing knowledge of new educational techniques.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SHADED AREA

A	Behavioral objectives understood	0	1	2	3	4	5
B	Behavioral objectives operational	0	1	2	3	4	5
C	Percentage of workshops attended this year	0	1	2	3	4	5
D	No. of days in past month parental involvement	0	1	2	3	4	5
E	No. of parents involved in last month	0	1	2	3	4	5
F	What teacher did	0	1	2	3	4	5
G	Primary teaching approach	0	1	2	3	4	5
H	Teacher employment of affective techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
J	What students did	0	1	2	3	4	5
K	Activity center in use	0	1	2	3	4	5
L	Selection of materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
M	% of observation - whole group instruction	0	1	2	3	4	5
N	% of observation - 2 or 3 group instruction	0	1	2	3	4	5
P	% of observation - more than 3 groups	0	1	2	3	4	5
Q	% of observation - individual activity (some)	0	1	2	3	4	5
R	% of observation - individual activity (all)	0	1	2	3	4	5
S	Discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
T	What student teacher did	0	1	2	3	4	5
U	What aid did	0	1	2	3	4	5
V	Evidence observed for promotion of Hispanic culture	0	1	2	3	4	5
W		0	1	2	3	4	5
X		0	1	2	3	4	5
Y		0	1	2	3	4	5
Z		0	1	2	3	4	5

A.1.Familiar with
2.Not familiar with
B.1.Yes
2.No
3.Unable to judge
4.Not implemented
5.N/A
C.1.0-20%
2.21-40%
3.41-60%
4.61-80%
5.81-100%
D.1.0 E.1.0
2.1-5 2.1-2
3.6-10 3.3-5
4.11-15 4.6-8
5.16-20 5.9+
F.1.Unstructured
2.Structured/resource
3.Guided
4.Show,demonstrate and/or explain
5.Other (specify)
G.1.Permissive
2.Problem solving
3.Discussion
4.Drill
5.Lecture
H.1.Yes
2.No
3.N/A
J.1.Paper-pencil
2.Listening
3.Discussion
4.Project/Lab
5.Listening and handling
K.1.Yes
2.No
3.N/A
4.None present
L.1.Ind. choice
2.Ind. prescribed
3.Sub-group prescribed
4.Class
5.Unable to judge

Use this space to record problems noted, alternate solutions, suggested action, when and to whom you reported them, and any other pertinent comments:

OVERPRINT LIMITS

OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS RESEARCH

1

This form was developed for use in evaluation of federally funded projects.

Read CAUTION first!

1) PROJECT
2) PBRS NO.
3) SCHOOL
4) SCHOOL NUMBER
5) OBSERVER
6) DATE — DAY — 197—
7) OFFICIAL CONTACT ON ARRIVAL AT SITE: PRINCIPAL, VICE PRINCIPAL, ADM. ASST., SECRETARY, OTHER (EXPLAIN)
8) OBSERVATION BEGAN AT OR AFTER
9) OBSERV. LASTED AT LEAST HR. MIN.
10) SPECIFIC CONDITIONS OBSERVED

Interview teacher for items A-D.
After determining A, ask the teacher to rank, from 1-5, PUENP's priorities.
___Training student teachers.
___Reorganizing the school for the employment of new educational techs
___Increasing the amount of individualized or small-group instruction.
___Increasing teachers' affective skills.
___Increasing knowledge of new educational techniques.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SHADED AREA

A	Behavioral objectives understood	1 2 3 4 5
B	Behavioral objectives operational	1 2 3 4 5
C	Percentage of workshops attended this year	1 2 3 4 5
D	No. of days in past month parental involvement	1 2 3 4 5
E	No. of parents involved in last month	1 2 3 4 5
F	What teacher did	1 2 3 4 5
G	Primary teaching approach	1 2 3 4 5
H	Teacher employment of affective techniques	1 2 3 4 5
J	What students did	1 2 3 4 5
K	Activity center in use	1 2 3 4 5
L	Selection of materials	1 2 3 4 5
M	% of observation - whole group instruction	1 2 3 4 5
N	% of observation - 2 or 3 group instruction	1 2 3 4 5
P	% of observation - more than 3 groups	1 2 3 4 5
Q	% of observation - individual activity (some)	1 2 3 4 5
R	% of observation - individual activity (all)	1 2 3 4 5
S	Discipline	1 2 3 4 5
T	What student teacher did	1 2 3 4 5
U	What aid did	1 2 3 4 5
V	Evidence observed for promotion of Hispanic culture	1 2 3 4 5
W		1 2 3 4 5
X		1 2 3 4 5
Y		1 2 3 4 5
Z		1 2 3 4 5

A.1.Familiar with
2.Not familiar with
B.1.Yes
2.No
3.Unable to judge
4.Not implemented
5.N/A
C.1.0-20%
2.21-40%
3.41-60%
4.61-80%
5.81-100%
D.1.0 E.1.0
2.1-5 2.1-
3.6-10 3.3-
4.11-15 4.6-8
5.16-20 5.9+
F.1.Unstructured
2.Structured/ resource
3.Guided
4.Show, demonstrate and/or explain
5.Other (specify)
G.1.Permissive
2.Problem solving
3.Discussion
4.Drill
5.Lecture
H.1.Yes
2.No
3.N/A
J.1.Paper-pencil
2.Listening
3.Discussion
4.Project/Lab
5.Listening and handling
K.1.Yes
2.No
3.N/A
4.None present
L.1.Ind. choice
2.Ind. prescribed
3.Sub-group prescribed
4.Class
5.Unable to judge

Use this space to record problems noted, alternate solutions, suggested action, when and to whom you reported them, and any other pertinent comments:

CAUTION: Do not smudge the underside of this form. Place it on a clean, expendable sheet of paper. See User's Guide.

OVERPRINT LIMITS

DC 8561 ... OPTICAL SCANNING CORPORATION

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PROJECT WORKSHOPS

Cluster Planning Sessions

Spanish language and Puerto Rican culture

Space utilization; Evaluation

Construction of classroom furniture

Community Open House

Interstate Urban Network Schools Conferences (Harrisburg)

Creative Dramatics

Community Social Services

Systems 80; Evaluation update

Interstate Urban Network Schools Conference (Washington)

Cultural Awareness Program

Community Open House

Diagnosis of Learning Disabilities

Mathematics Workshop

Black and Puerto Rican dialect

Cultural Awareness Program

Community Open House

Interstate Urban Network Schools Conference (New York)

Community Open House

Parents' Mathematics Workshops (weekly)

Affective Education Workshops for Reading Aides (weekly)

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCES SERVICES

PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROGRAM
SUMMARY OF PRE-OBSERVATIONAL DATA

The following summary is based on data collected during 25 observations made during October and November.

Dates of Observation	Number
October 19, 1974	3
October 18, 1974	6
October 23, 1974	2
October 25, 1974	1
October 30, 1974	3
November 12, 1974	6
November 20, 1974	4
	25

Length of Observation (minutes)	Number
0 - 19	0
20 - 29	2
30 - 39	5
40 - 49	10
50 - 59	5
60 - 69	3

Teachers ranked the project objectives in the order of their understanding of the priorities. The ranking was as follows:

1. To increase teachers' affective skills.
2. To increase the amount of individualized or small group instruction.
3. To increase teachers' knowledge of new educational techniques.
4. To transmit these skills to student teachers.
5. To reorganize the school for the employment of new educational techniques.

Seventy-two percent of the teachers observed felt they understood the project objectives, while 56% felt them to be operational in their own classrooms.

Fourty-two percent of the teachers reported no involvement with parents. Of those who did report some contact, 36% said it was limited to less than 5 parents.

Teacher behavior observed during the observations was as follows:

13% - instructured
8% - structured/resource
60% - guided
13% - show, demonstrate, and/or explain
6% - other

Observed teaching approaches were as follows:

27% - permissive
0% - problem solving
10% - discussion
63% - drill
0% - lecture

No affective techniques (e.g., role playing, "I" message, magic circle) were observed.

Activity centers were present in 70% of the classrooms. Of these, 31% were seen in use.

Selection of materials was observed to have occured by the following methods:

14% - individual's choice
0% - individually prescribed
30% - sub-group prescribed
56% - class prescribed
0% - unable to judge

Class arrangement and grouping were as follows:

21% - instruction for 2 or more groups
70% - whole group instruction
27% - some of the students involved in individual activity
73% - no individualized activity

Classroom discipline was observed as follows:

36% - negligible
56% - moderate
8% - extensive

Student teacher behaviors were classified as follows:

19% - individual or small group assistance
0% - individual or small group tutoring
0% - small group instruction
13% - whole group instruction
68% - other - helped maintain order, none present in 9 classes

Aide behaviors were classified as follows:

43% - individual or small group assistance
0% - individual or small group tutoring
9% - small group instruction
0% - whole group instruction
48% - other - none present

In 22% of the classes, some evidence for the promotion of the Hispanic culture. This was evidenced by classroom decorations and by teachers speaking Spanish in a non-Spanish lesson.

Summary

The reported data was obtained from 25 observations made during October and November. The major findings can be summarized as follows:

- Approximately 75% of the teachers understood the project's objectives.
- Parental involvement was of a minimal amount.
- The majority of instruction consisted of either guided or drill techniques.
- No affective techniques were observed.
- In approximately 25% of the observations, small group and/or individualized instruction was seen.
- Student-teachers and aides tended to be involved with small groups, either assisting or instructing them.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

PHILADELPHIA URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK PROJECT
SUMMARY OF POST-OBSERVATIONAL DATA

The following is a summary of data collected during 10 classroom observations made during May and June.

Dates of Observation	Number
May 28, 1975	3
June 5, 1975	4
June 6, 1975	3
	10

Length of Observation (minutes)	Number
0 - 19	0
20 - 29	0
30 - 39	8
40 - 49	2
50 - 59	0
60 - 69	0

Teachers were not asked to rank the project objectives in the order of the understanding of the priorities. This had been completed by all teachers by November. Also, workshops had concentrated on this issue, and the expressed priorities paralleled the ranking of the objectives.

One hundred percent of the teachers observed felt they understood the project's objectives, while 90% of them felt them to be operational in their classrooms.

Teacher behavior observed during the observations was as followed:

20% - instructured
0% - structured/resource
60% - guided
20% - show, demonstrate, and/or explain
0% - other

Observed teaching approaches were as follows:

20% - permissive
0% - problem solving
10% - discussion
70% - drill
0% - lecture

An affective checklist was developed by the teachers, the project coordinator, and the project evaluator. The following were the five most frequently observed affective behaviors:

- having students contribute something they know how to do
- let kids feel good about themselves sometime during the day
- encourage children to relate to teachers as people by relating personal experiences
- displaying children's work
- putting child at ease in learning situations, exhibiting that you feel they can do

Activity centers were present in 90% of the classrooms. However, only in 40% of the classrooms were they observed in use.

The selection of materials was observed to have occured by the following methods:

0% - individual's choice
20% - individually prescribed
60% - sub group prescribed
10% - class prescribed
0% - unable to judge

Class arrangement and grouping were observed to be as follows:

70% - instruction for 2 or more groups
30% - whole group instruction
40% - some of the students involved in individualized activity
60% - no individualized activity

Classroom discipline was observed as follows:

50% - negligible
50% - moderate
0% - extensive

During late May and early June, when the observations were made, no student - teachers were present. However, the evaluator did observe all eight of the student - teachers in April. Their teaching behaviors included individual or small group assistance and tutoring, and small and whole group instruction. The evaluator also observed a greater degree of individualized and small-group instruction than was present in May and June.

Aide (PUENP, classroom, and reading) behaviors included the following:

20% - individual or small group assistance
0% - individual or small group tutoring
40% - small group instruction
0% - whole group instruction
10% - other -- none present

In 90% of the classes, some evidence of the promotion of the Hispanic culture was present. This was evidenced by a slide show of Puerto Rico, classroom decorations, and the results of student projects.

Summary

The reported data way obtained from 10 classroom observations made during May and June. The major results can be summarized as follows:

- All of the project participants understood the project's objectives; in 90% of the classes, they were operational.
- The majority of the instruction consisted of the guided or drill techniques.
- An affective behavior checklist was developed and used during the observations. Affective behaviors were observed.
- In 70% of the classes, small-group instruction was seen.
- In 40% of the classes, some students engaged in individualized instruction
- No student - teachers were present for any observations. Aides were mainly involved with small groups, either assisting or instructing them.

Comparison of Early - and Late - Year Observations

The following is a list of the major differences between the early - (October and November) and late-year (May and June) observations.

- Early in the year, 75% of the teachers knew about and understood the project's objectives. Later in the year, all teachers understood them.

- The majority of the instruction throughout the year consisted of either guided or drill techniques.

- No affective techniques were observed early in the year, whereas, later they were observed.

- Early- year observations indicated in 25% of the observations small groups or individualized instruction was seen. The second set of observations show that the percentage of small group instruction increased to 70% and the comparable figure for the individualized instruction increased to 40%.

- Student - teacher and aide roles remained fixed. Both engaged in small group and individual assistance, tutoring, and instruction.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

PUENP AFFECTIVE CHECKLIST

_____ Show and Tell.

_____ Have students contribute something they know how to do.

_____ Tell children what the purpose of a lesson is.

_____ Problem box - problems of child at school or home that could be recognized and discussed in school - would not have to be signed.

_____ Role-playing.

_____ Special Day - Kid's Day.

_____ Let kids feel good about themselves sometime during the day.

_____ Don't always concentrate on "academics".

_____ Conferences with students.

_____ Encourage children to relate to teachers as people by relating personal experiences.

_____ Learning through doing - sales, pricing, selling, recording expenses and profits.

_____ Group projects - setting up aquarium.

_____ Adults should use humanistic educational techniques among themselves in order to employ them successfully with the students.

_____ Putting child at ease in learning situation, exhibiting that you feel they can do.

_____ Don't only listen to child's opinion but <u>use</u> their opinions. A child will act responsibly to the degree that he participates in the management of the classroom. (Pygmallion effect on the affective level). Most children have some flexibility of behavior - nudge him (her) toward a more responsible role.

_____ Discuss problems with children - discuss possible alternatives.

_____ Magic circle.

_____ "I" Message - discuss feelings with regard to their behavior towards teacher and peers.

_____ Explain, Explain, Explain. Why we are upset, what we want, what we expect and get similar information from them.

_____ Positive rather than negative reinforcement.

_____ Sensitivity sessions.

_____ Displaying children's work.

APPENDIX G

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Philadelphia Urban Education Network Program
Summary of Student Teacher Questionnaire
October, 1974

3. Grades taught:

K	1	2	3	4	Spec. Eduation
1	1	3	2	2	2

4. What classroom learning arrangements did you try at Hunter?
   7 Individually prescribed
   7 Activity - centered
   7 Traditional
   0 Other

5. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you use the most? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Individually prescribed
   2 Traditional
   3 Activity - centered

6. Of those classroom arrangements, that you tried, which did you feel the most success with? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Individually prescribed
   2 Activity - centered
   2 Traditional

7. Rank as best you can the degree to which the following factors influenced your primary teaching style at Hunter School. (ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Suggestions from collaborating teacher
   2 Other - books, college courses
   3 examples set by your collaborating teacher
   4 Hunter workshops

8. Categorize the predominant styles of teaching you observed in your classroom.
   First style
   1 Traditional
   2 Activity - centered
   3 Other - small group instruction
   4 Individually prescribed

   Second style
   1 Individually prescribed
   2 Activity - centered
   3 Traditional
   4 Other - small group instruction

9. What areas did you receive the most information and help on during your stay at Hunter? (areas are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1	Discipline	7	Observation and Recording Techniques
2	Curriculum		
3	Methodology of teaching	8.5	Games
4	Learning theories	8.5	Community
5	Nitty gritty of day today survival (e.g., planning, etc.)	10	Audio Visual techniques
		11	Group Dynamics
6	Administration		

10. To what extent did you observe individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 0 Slightly 0 Moderately 4 Extensively 3

11. To what extent did you use individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction in the classroom?

Not at all 0 Slightly 1 Moderately 3 Extensively 3

12. To what extent did you observe affective techniques being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 1 Slightly 1 Moderately 4 Extensively 1

13. To what extent did you use affective techniques while at Hunter?

Not at all 1 Slightly 0 Moderately 4 Extensively 2

14. In what ways did your cooperating teacher help you adjust to inner-city school teaching?
- discipline methods
- not relevant question
- observing teacher
- stress importance of reading
- explaining children's background

15. If you had an opportunity to come back to Hunter School to teach next year, would you? Why or why not?

YES - 6 NO - 0 UNDECIDED - 1
- enjoyable experience
- liked cluster
- personalized approach good
- warm atmosphere in school
- much positive work happening at Hunter

16. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc. you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.
- more college courses about inner city
- more observations
- help came from all angles
- genuine interest on part of principal, coordinator, counselor, and teachers

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Philadelphia Urban Education Network Program
Summary of Student Teacher Questionnaire
December, 1974

3. Grades taught:

K	1	2	3	4	5	Spec. Education
1	2	4	4	6	7	

4. What classroom learning arrangements did you try at Hunter?
   6 Individually prescribed
   5 Activity - centered
   6 Traditional

5. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you use the most? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Individually prescribed
   2 Traditional
   3 Activity centered

6. Of those classroom arrangements, that you tried, which did you feel the most success with? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Individually prescribed
   2 Traditional
   3 Activity - centered

7. Rank as best you can the degree to which the following factors influence your primary teaching style at Hunter School. (ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Suggestions from your collaborating teacher
   2 Examples set by your collaborating teacher
   3 Hunter workshops
   4 Other - education at college, other teaching experience, own style, magazines, suggestions of faculty

8. Categorize the predominant styles of teaching you observed in your classroom.
   First style
   1.5 Individually prescribed
   1.5 Traditional
   3 Activity - centered

9. What areas did you receive the most information and help on during your stay at Hunter? (areas are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1	Discipline	7	Administration
2	Curriculum	8	Community
3.5	Nitty gritty of day to day survival (e.g., planning, etc.)	9	Games
		10	Group dynamics
3.5	Methodology of teaching	11	Audio-visual techniques
5	Learning theories		
6	Observation and Recording techniques		

10. To what extent did you observe individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 1 Slightly 1 Moderately 4 Extensively 2

11. To what extent did you use individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction in the classroom?

Not at all 1 Slightly 0 Moderately 2 Extensively 3

12. To what extent did you observe affective techniques being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 0 Slightly 2 Moderately 3 Extensively 1

13. To what extent did you use affective techniques while at Hunter?

Not at all 0 Slightly 2 Moderately 2 Extensively 2

14. In what ways did your cooperating teacher help you adjust to inner-city school teaching?
- reading most important
- helpful criticism
- example of teacher
- encouragement
- community involvement

15. If you had an opportunity to come back to Hunter School to teach next year, would you? Why or why not?
YES - 6 NO - 0

16. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc. you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.
- some of the teachers weren't concerned enough
- more observations of inner city classes
- teachers helpful

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Philadelphia Urban Education Network Program
Summary of Student Teacher Questionnaire
March, 1975

3. Grades taught:

K	1	2	3	4	Spec. Education
	1	3	3	3	2

4. What classroom learning arrangements did you try at Hunter?
   4 Individually prescribed
   7 Activity - centered
   7 Traditional
   2 Other - project centered, address a small group

5. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you use the most? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Activity - centered
   2 Traditional
   3 Individually prescribed
   4 Other - project centered, address a small group

6. Of those classroom arrangements, that you tried, which did you feel the most success with? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Activity - centered
   2 Individually prescribed
   3 Other - project centered, address a small group
   4 Traditional

7. Rank as best you can the degree to which the following factors influenced your primary teaching style at Hunter School. (ranked in order of frequency of response)
   1 Examples set by your collaborating teacher
   2 Other - basic curriculum courses, own ideas, books, collaborating with others, pre-student teaching experience
   3 Suggestions from your collaborating teacher
   4 Hunter workshops

8. Categorize the predominant styles of teaching you observed in your classroom.
   First style
   1 Traditional
   2 Activity - centered
   3 Other - small group instruction
   4 Individually prescribed

9. What areas did you recieve the most information and help on during your stay at Hunter? (areas are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1 Methodology of teaching
2 Discipline
3 Nitty gritty of day to day survival
4 Curriculum observation and recording
5 Techniques
6 Community
7 Group dynamics
8 Games
9 Learning theories
10 Administration
11 Audio-Visual techniques

10. To what extent did you observe individualized instructional techniques and small-group instruction being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 0 Slightly 2 Moderately 1 Extensively 4

11. To what extent did you use individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction in the classroom?

Not at all 0 Slightly 1 Moderately 3 Extensively 3

12. To what extent did you observe affective techniques being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 0 Slightly 2 Moderately 4 Extensively 1

13. To what extent did you use affective techniques while at Hunter?

Not at all 0 Slightly 1 Moderately 5 Extensively 0

14. In what ways did your cooperating teacher help you adjust to inner-city school teaching?

- Discipline was a real problem for me - he made me gain confidence and assert myself, and also change my idealistic ideas of the teaching profession to a realistic view.

- We talked about differences from other schools, discipline problems, and how to handle them, the difference a home background can make and how it shows up. She helped me with any questions and problems I had.

- My cooperating helped me by showing me various effective ways to get students to respond, no matter what the subject.

- I am a product of the inner city schools so there was no real adjustment.

- My co-op told me about the area, the conditions of the community and about the attitudes of the children. I have a better understanding of their problems.

- She allowed me to work at my own speed in adjusting to the classroom. She also gave me free reign to do whatever I felt I wanted to do. This was the most important aspect in my learning experiences.

15. If you had an opportunity to come back to Hunter School to teach next year, would you? Why or why not?

- Of course, I found this to be a challenging experience. The children are warm and ready to respond to the challenges I give them. It has been a rewarding experience.

- Yes, I like the kids - the faculty were nice to me. The school has the advantage of many programs (ESOL and the reading programs, especially PUENP)

- Yes, I would because the teaching atmosphere here is very comfortable, everyone is willing to assist you regardless of the problem in any way possible.

- Yes, because of Mr. Friend and the Title III meeting.

- Yes, I think I could really get involved in doing my thing with these kids.... I'm getting to like them alot.

- Yes, because I have learned alot from the Hunter School. As for the ways of teaching and disciplining children are concerned.

- If given a choice of Hunter and another inner-city school, I'd probably choose the other school, because I've seen the split in the faculty and I would not necessarily like to walk into the situation already labeled as having chosen sides. If, however, Hunter was my only opportunity to work in an inner city school I would definitely take the job. I would have to overlook the feelings of the faculty and look to my own feelings of wanting to work with inner-city children.

16. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc. you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.

- I enjoyed working with Ms. Hribovski. She is a very pleasant and encouraging person to be with, and a good model to follow.

- The only problem I have encountered is the lack of a coordinated program. Curriculum guides need to be used. Things are taught one year and instead of continuing and building on this foundation the teacher does not know what for sure what they have learned and reteaches this.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Philadelphia Urban Education Network Program
Summary of Student Teacher Questionnaire

May, 1975

3. Grades taught:

K	1	2	3	4	Spec. Education
0	3	3	5	5	3

4. What classroom learning arrangements did you try at Hunter?

8 individually prescribed
8 Activity-centered
7 Traditional
5 Other - Circus (for Cluster), open space, small group

5. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you use the most? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1 Other - Circus, open space, small group instruction
2 Traditional
3 Individually prescribed
4 Activity-centered

6. Of those classroom arrangements that you tried, which did you feel the most success with? (arrangements are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1 Other - Circus, open space, small group instruction
2 Traditional
3 Individually prescribed
4 Activity-centered

7. Rank as best you can the degree to which the following factors influence your primary teaching style at Hunter School. (ranked in order of frequency of response)

1 Examples set by your collaborating teacher
2 Suggestions from your collaborating teacher
3 Other - trying out my own ideas, classroom aides, Supervisor, consulting others, previous experiences, using library
4 Hunter workshops

8. Categorize the predominant styles of teaching you observed in your classroom.

First style

1 Other - small group
2.5 Individually prescribed
2.5 Activity-centered
4 Traditional

Second style

1 Activity-centered
2 Traditional
3 Individually prescribed

9. What areas did you receive the most information and help on during your stay at Hunter? (areas are ranked in order of frequency of response)

1	Nitty-gritty of day to day survival (e.g., planning, etc.)	6	Curriculum
2	Discipline	7	Community
3	Methodology of teaching	8	Observation and recording techniques
4	Group dynamics	9	Administration
5	Learning theories	10	Audio-visual techniques
		11	Games

10. To what extent did you observe individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 0 Slightly 0 Moderately 2 Extensively 6

11. To what extent did you use individualized instructional techniques and small group instruction in the classroom?

Not at all 0 Slightly 0 Moderately 4 Extensively 4

12. To what extent did you observe affective techniques being used in the classroom by your collaborating teacher?

Not at all 1 Slightly 1 Moderately 3 Extensively 3

13. To what extent did you use affective techniques while at Hunter?

Not at all 0 Slightly 0 Moderately 5 Extensively 3

14. In what ways did your cooperating teacher help you adjust to inner-city school teaching?

- He told me about the children, gave me various suggestions on methods I could try, and his own techniques and methods helped me adjust to inner-city schools.
- My Special Education teacher helped me adjust by showing me that special education children can be taught with the proper teaching techniques, love, practice, and respect.
- She explained the reactions of the children to certain things that are characteristic of the inner city.
- With her suggestions and advice on a day to day basis, especially concerning discipline, methods, and lesson planning.
- Planning for day to day activities.

- My cooperating teacher gave me the confidence I needed in dealing with these children. She always gave me suggestions in dealing with discipline and moral support when things didn't go right. She also was a good model to follow and enrich my experience.
- She guided me, but also left me alone to try my own method. Also offered advice.

15. If you had an opportunity to come back to Hunter School to teach next year, would you? Why or why not?

Yes - 8 No - 0

- Yes, because I like the way the curriculum is set up.
- Yes, I love Hunter School - it has made me want to get out there and really teach to children and not at them.
- Yes, because at Hunter everyone makes you feel welcome and you can receive help in anything from everyone. They're all kind!!
- Yes, this school was very friendly towards me when I first arrived. There is a lot of caring on the part of the administration and the teachers.
- Yes, I liked working here - the staff has been friendly and helpful to me. I like the kids and would like to teach and work with them.
- Yes, I enjoyed working with the children. Most of the faculty was friendly and cooperative.
- I really enjoyed being at Hunter. The experiences I received here have prepared me for most schools and I would gladly return.
- Yes, the kids are really great. They have their moments but they are the best kids I've ever had.

16. Please list any other comments, suggestions, etc., you may have that have not been covered in any of the other questions.

- I've enjoyed my stay at Hunter School and was very pleased with my cooperating teacher.
- I feel that Hunter School is doing all that it can to make the school a home. I have never met more friendly, pleasant, and interesting people. PUENP is full of great suggestions and I feel these workshops should be mandatory for all student teachers to help them get new and unique classroom ideas. The only sad note is that I didn't see too much community involvement, which I feel could have helped a great deal more! Well, what can I say - I love Hunter School!!!
- Hunter School is a very interesting place to work. I feel they are doing a wonderful job with the PUENP and also the ESOL program. Both are good since they offer things that teachers and Spanish-speaking students need to know.
- I think an important part of the school atmosphere is the relationship between teachers. I have found affective techniques used many times between students and teachers, and I feel these techniques should be used among teachers.